

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 9/8/2006
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

REMARKS

Summary of Interview

The following summarizes the substance of an interview conducted with Examiner Walsh on October 4, 2006, in accordance with the guidelines provided by MPEP 713.04.

- (A) No exhibit was shown, and no demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Claim 1 was discussed.
- (C) The teachings of Shapiro *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,965,926) were primarily discussed.
- (D) An amendment to Claim 1 was discussed, emphasizing that the first and second communication interfaces are distinct.
- (E) The general thrust of Applicant's arguments presented at the interview was that Shapiro does not teach or suggest a mobile terminal having first and second distinct communication interfaces. The Examiner indicated that the claims, if so amended, would not be anticipated by Shapiro.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful and thoughtful examination of the present application. By way of summary, Claims 1, 2, 11, 22, 23, 32, 43, 44 and 53 were pending in this application. In this response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 22 and 43. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2, 11, 22, 23, 32, 43, 44 and 53 remain pending for consideration.

The Applicants would also like to thank Examiner Walsh for the interview extended to the Applicants. During the interview, the Applicants clarified patentably distinguishing features of the invention and an agreement was reached relating to claim language. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 22 and 43 along the lines discussed in the interview. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending amended claims.

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 9/8/2006
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 11, 22, 23, 32, 43, 44 and 53 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,965,926 issued to Shapiro *et al.* (Shapiro). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the Shapiro patent fails to identically teach every element of the amended claims. See M.P.E.P. § 2131 (stating that in order to anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must identically teach every element of the claim).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as previously pending were patentably distinguished over the Shapiro patent. Independent Claims 1, 22 and 43, however, have been amended in order to clarify the features of the Applicants' inventions, as discussed during the October 4th interview.

For example, independent Claim 1 now recites a "method of operating a mobile terminal having first and second distinct communication interfaces, the method comprising the steps of: (a) receiving a first component of a document over a first communication channel via the first communication interface; (b) receiving a second component of the document over a second communication channel via the second communication interface; (c) displaying the first component of the document before completion of the receipt of the second component of the document; and (d) combining the first and second components of the document at the mobile terminal." The Shapiro patent does not disclose the method set forth in Claim 1 of operating a mobile terminal having first and second distinct communication interfaces.

Instead, the Shapiro patent teaches that each email client node 435A-C has a single communication interface through which documents are received. Col. 10, ll. 49-54. The Shapiro patent further teaches that the communication interface may be an Ethernet network interface card or a modem. Col. 10, ll. 58-61. However, Shapiro neither teaches nor suggests the step of receiving a first component of a document over a first communication channel via a mobile terminal's first communication interface, and receiving a second component of the document over a second communication channel via a mobile terminal's second and distinct communication interface.

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 9/8/2006
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872

Independent Claims 22 and 43 are allowable for at least substantially the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 1. They too have been amended to recite first and second distinct communication interfaces.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that every pending independent claim incorporates at least one limitation that is not taught or suggested by Shapiro, and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2, 11, 23, 32, 44 and 53 are dependent upon the above independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons given above.

Art Unit 2151
Serial No. 09/918,666

Reply to Office Action of 9/8/2006
Attorney Docket No.: K35A0872


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance and request reconsideration of the rejections. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1209.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2006

By: 
Jason T. Evans, Esq.
Reg. No. 57,862

WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
20511 Lake Forest Drive
Lake Forest, CA 92630
Tel.: (949) 672-7000
Fax: (949) 672-6604